

Amendments to the Drawings:

Examiner Burch pointed out to the applicant's attorney that the external apparatus set forth in claim 8 is not shown in the drawings. Accordingly, applicant has prepared a replacement sheet for FIG. 1 wherein the external apparatus is represented by the box identified by reference numeral 70. The disclosure is amended to incorporate this reference numeral on page 11. The Examiner's approval of the replacement sheet is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Remarks

Claim 1, 10 and 11 are cancelled and claims 2, 4 to 7 and 9 are amended. Claims 2 to 9 are pending in this application of which only claim 2 is in independent format.

Applicant's attorney thanks Examiner Burch for the telephone interview held on June 23, 2005; July 7, 2005; July 8, 2005 and July 29, 2005 and for her assistance with respect to the advisory actions. It was mutually agreed that claims 2, 3 and 9 are in condition for allowance as they appear in the non-entered amendment filed on June 23, 2005 as modified in the supplemental draft amendment submitted on July 8th and as supplemented by the changes to claim 9 discussed on July 8th.

Accordingly, applicant herewith resubmits his amendment with claims 2, 3 and 9 in allowable form and cancels herein rejected claims 1, 10 and 11. Claims 3 to 7 are amended to make the same dependent directly or indirectly from claim 2 and claim 8 is dependent from claim 7.

The reasons advanced with respect to the claims' objection and the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, are included hereinafter so that they will be of record.

In paragraph 1 of the final action, claims 2, 3 and 9 were objected to for informalities regarding recitations of a first and a second switching state.

In particular, the Office objected to the recitation to a first and a second switching state in lines 42 and 43 and 70 of claim 2 and suggested to clarify that these recitations refer back to the switching states recited in line 17 of the claim.

Applicant notes that the switching states referred to in

lines 17 and 42 and 43 are the switching states of the first and second controllable directional valves, while the switching state referred to in lines 70 is the switching state of the third directional valve.

Taking these relationships into account, applicant has amended the claims closely following the Office's suggestion.

In paragraphs 2 and 3, the Office rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the view was expressed that it was unclear whether the "first and second pressurized supply vessels" recited in the last line of the claim are intended to be the same or different from the "pressurized medium supply vessel means" recited in line 6 of claim 1.

In response, applicant has amended claim 4 to make the same dependent from claim 2 and to clarify that the recited first and second pressurized supply vessels are specific embodiments of the pressurized medium supply vessel means.

In paragraph 8, the Office considered claims 2, 3 and 9 allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended independent claim 2 to overcome the Office's objections. Claim 2 should therefore be allowable. Claims 3 and 9 are dependent from claim 2 and have not been independently objected to so that these claims should also be in condition for allowance. Also, claims 4 to 8 are now all

dependent from claim 2 so these too should now be allowable.

Applicant's attorney thanks Examiner Burch for the telephone interview held on July 7, 2005 and for her careful review of the claims and for the follow-up telephone interview held on July 8th at which time the draft supplemental amendment was discussed which had been submitted earlier in the day on July 8th.

Examiner Burch noted that in claim 9, the intake valve and discharge valve recited therein appeared to have no antecedent basis in the disclosure. The clause directed to the intake valve is deleted and the phrase -- air inlet/air outlet -- is substituted therefor. This air inlet/air outlet is identified in the drawings by reference numeral 46 and is referred to in the applicant's disclosure, for example, on page 12, lines 2 to 6. The discharge valve is the controllable directional valve identified by reference numeral 30 in FIG. 1 of the drawings. In the claim, it has been referred to as an ancillary controllable directional valve to distinguish it from the other controllable directional valves and to provide adequate antecedent basis for this term in the remainder of the claim. Applicant quotes claim 9 below supplemented by reference numerals so that it can be quickly associated with the drawing:

    "an air dryer (10) mounted in said  
    fourth pressurized air line (4);

    an air inlet/air outlet (46);

    an intake line (5) ending at said air  
    inlet/air outlet (46) and connecting said  
    input (14) of said compressor (8) to the  
    atmosphere via said air inlet/air  
    outlet (46);

    an additional controllable directional

valve (30) switchable between a base position wherein no throughflow is permitted and a switched position wherein throughflow is permitted to said air inlet/air outlet (46);

said second pressurized line (2) branching off from said fourth pressurized air line (4) at a branch point (27) between said output (16) of said compressor (8) and said air dryer (10) and ending at said additional controllable directional valve (30); and,


said pressurized medium supply vessel means (12, 13) being connectable to the atmosphere via said air dryer (10) and said second pressurized line (2) when said additional controllable directional valve (30) is in said switched position thereof." (parenthetical material added)

Claim 9 should now have sufficient antecedent basis in the drawings and disclosure so that claim 9 should now be definite as required by the statute.

The proposed replacement sheet of drawings is discussed under the drawing section of this amendment and is submitted herewith.

The application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: August 1, 2005